

Date: Tue, 14 Dec 93 04:30:15 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #525
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Tue, 14 Dec 93 Volume 93 : Issue 525

Today's Topics:

```
(none)
ARRL's callsign admin position (2 msgs)
  Can my wife transmit? (3 msgs)
    Question about radio pirating...
      The 10-meters band - No CW required ?
        W5YI's coverage of "temporary callsigns"
          Why should I bother? (2 msgs)
```

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>

Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>

Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available (by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 13 Dec 93 14:48:29 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: (none)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>But what is really incredible was the amount of flak I have caught for the
>"crime" of not quoting liberally from the posts I reply to! I've certainly

if i recall correctly...

the crime wasn't that you weren't including other information.
"overquoting" can be a problem as well.

the problem is you assumed that everyone out here sees everything like you see it on Delphi. Ahhhnold would say "Big Mistake".

some people don't even have news. they get digests from a listserver and are *really* working behind the power curve (but it's what they can get and make do with it). this all started, if i remember, because you had a posting that left a lot of people in "Say what?" mode and they requested that it would be helpful to include some sort of reference to what aspect of a previous message you were replying to such that everyone else could follow along.

sometimes posting w/o quoting makes it like being in a roundtable where you can't hear everyone. you feel like you are just out of range for the transmitting station and can only hear the net control's answers.

bill wb9ivr

Date: 12 Dec 93 13:56:43 GMT
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!concert!news.duke.edu!
duke!wolves!psybbs!fredmail@ames.arpa
Subject: ARRL's callsign admin position
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

on <Dec 06 14:47>, Greg Bullough to All said:

GB> As far as I can tell, the ARRL's position is that they are the
GB> one and only voice of Amateur Radio in the US, whatever
GB> position the Board takes is immediately the one with which
GB> the majority of US Amateurs concur, and any interface to
GB> Federal policymakers should be through them, and them alone.

Indeed? Since I'm a dumb newcomer, can you please tell me all the other national-level lobbying groups acting in amateurs' interests?

Date: 13 Dec 93 19:35:15 GMT
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net
Subject: ARRL's callsign admin position
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.misc, dan@mystis.wariat.org (Dan Pickersgill N8PKV) writes:

>
>Again, the ARRL Guys I have met here have been helpfull in the
>EXTREAM!!! Thank you to ALL you guys (& gals, not to be sexist). And I
>understand that there are CompuServ addresses too. GREAT!
>
>

You're welcome. And thank YOU for taking the time to express appreciation in public.

Yes, we're on Compuserve. At least six times a day. Every day, weekends and holidays included. And we're on NVN, BIX, Prodigy, America On Line and GEnie to boot.

And -- when we can find the time -- we actually get on the radio as well. Sigh...

```
|      |  |      Deputy Manager, Field Services, ARRL.
|      |___|      The ARRL Amateur Radio Emergency Service, the ARRL
| uck  |   |urder  National Traffic System, The Amateur Auxiliary to
-----|   |      the FCC's Field Operations Bureau, the ARRL
      KY1T      Field Organization and the ARRL Monitoring System.
```

lhurder@arrl.org Prodigy - MGTS39A, BIX - ARRL,
MCI Mail - RPALM, MCI Mail - "ARRL", America On Line - "ARRL HQ"
Compuserve - 70007,3373 (ARRL HQ) -- Genie ARRL.HQ

Date: 13 Dec 93 17:16:40 GMT
From: ogicse!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Can my wife transmit?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <L5Heec1w165w@mystis.wariat.org> dan@mystis.wariat.org (Dan Pickersgill N8PKV) writes:

>markm@bigfoot.sps.mot.com (Mark Monninger) writes:

>> My reaction to this would be WHO CARES what the FCC, etc. will do? If someone
>> life is in danger the other stuff isn't all that big of a consideration. I'd
>> certainly rather have a nasty-gram from the FCC than a tragedy.

>

>Yep, what it boils down to is this. Is the saftey of your family (in any
>given situation) worth loosing your license over. If so, why worry, have
>them call for help. No discussion is needed. If it is NOT worth you
>loosing your license, it _MAY_ not be that big of an emergency.

>

^^^^

> (Please note Highlight)

I'd state this more strongly. If violation of normal rules to service emergency traffic is, in your opinion, worth the *certainty* of forfeiting your license and your equipment, then by all means transmit. If the "emergency" isn't that critical, then maybe it isn't a real emergency after all, or your priorities are skewed. As Berretta used to say, "If you can't do the time, don't do the crime."

Gary

--

| | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| Gary Coffman KE4ZV | I kill you, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary |
| Destructive Testing Systems | You kill me, | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary |
| 534 Shannon Way | We're the Manson Family | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary |
| Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | -sorry Barney | |

Date: 12 Dec 1993 19:25:59 GMT
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!usc!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!caen!msuinfo!arctic2!
cravitma@ames.arpa
Subject: Can my wife transmit?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Dec12.052009.20130@ringer.cs.utsa.edu> dlaro@lonestar.utsa.edu
(David O. Laro) writes:

>In article <1993Dec9.200425.24723@mixcom.mixcom.com> kevin.jessup
<kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com> writes:

>>

>>Will she be fined for transmitting on amateur bands without a licence?

>>Will I be fined? Will I loose my licence? Will the radio be confiscated?

>

>Come on, think! How could you be fined for your wife's act?

Simple. Since he is a licensed ham and his wife is not, the assumption
that the FCC could reasonably make is that it is his radio. Therefore,
Part 97 mandates that he is responsible for ALL EMISSIONS from that
radio unless another qualified control operator is using the radio, in
which case they are JOINTLY responsible. Since his wife is not a ham,
he is responsible for ALL emissions coming from that radio.

>Since you're apparently concerned, why don't you:

- > a. Get her a cellular phone.
- > b. See that she gets her license.
- > c. Ask her not to drive through not-so-nice areas of town.
- > d. Try one of the other alternatives that can quickly spring to mind.

All valid suggestions.

>Hypothetical replies to questions about hypothetical situations don't always
>go where you want them to, Keven, but if you're really worried about having
>told her to use your radio, remember what my flight instructor told me: I'd
>rather be on the ground writing answers to all those violations they charge
>me with than in little pieces on a hillside.

True enough. :-)

/Matthew (Still waiting for my ticket, 5 weeks and counting)

--

| | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Matthew Cravit | All opinions expressed here are |
| Michigan State University | my own. I don't speak for Michigan |
| East Lansing, MI 48825 | State, and they don't speak for me |
| E-Mail: cravitma@cps.msu.edu | (thank goodness). |

Date: 10 Dec 93 11:32:32 EST
From: world!ksr!jfw@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Can my wife transmit?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com (kevin.jessup) writes:

>In article <36071@ksr.com>, jfw@ksr.com (John F. Woods) writes:

>>But it turns out that the Communications Act of 1934 authorizes *anyone*, not
>>just hams, to use any radio at their disposal in an emergency involving
>>possible loss of life if normal means of communication are unavailable.
>This opens up a whole can of legal worms. Let's try another example...

> [hypothetical tale-o-woe deleted]

>Please, ARRL and FCC people, can you answer this one?

Probably, they can't. As I said, you will likely be in the position of asking a court to answer it after the fact; if it's genuinely an emergency, that just won't seem like an issue at the time. The FCC almost certainly doesn't want to get into the business of describing exactly what is and isn't an emergency; for one thing, that's really the job of a court, and for another, as soon as they do describe something that is unambiguously an emergency and which would entitle anyone to use a radio without even a hint of complaint from the FCC, you'd get all the half the yammerheads on USENET here explaining how this directly implies, by a simple logical extension involving hopping up and down, waving their hands in the air, and stuffing their heads WAY UP where they don't belong, that it really is perfectly OK for them to run their cocaine-distribution business on 2 meters because it's an "emergency" if they don't make tons of money as rapidly as possible (and the other half of the yammerheads will be fulminating about how it's the END OF AMATEUR RADIO if people can save lives without an Amateur license).

Date: Tue, 07 Dec 93 22:27:29 EST
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!

usenet.ins.cwru.edu!nigel.msen.com!ilium!sycom!p-cove!wolfman@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Question about radio pirating...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I have a question that is probably easily answered.. I was wondering what is actually stopping the average joe off the street that doesn't have a license, picking a callsign at random and using the ham airwaves?? I know about DF'ing and "fox" hunting, but if that person is mobile and moves around a lot, how do they get caught?? I know that in a local area, the ham operators would get familiar with his voice and eventually find a way to track him down, but what about in big cities like new york and LA?? I have been wondering about this ever since I heard about the FCC planning on giving instant licenses to people that pass their test.... It would be very easy for people to use the air waves illegally then...

Thanks,
Aaron Smith KB8PFZ

wolfman@p-cove.uucp (Aaron Smith KB8PFZ)
System Operator of Pirate's Cove.
+1-313-982-7545, Port Huron, Mi
Be sure to watch MST3k!!!!

Date: 13 Dec 93 14:37:41 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>Well, Jeff, I did some reading of the history of amateur radio, and If I
>remember right, the morse code requirement first came about because when
>the first amateurs were demonstrating to the FCC, their voice modulators
>went out on them, so they switched to morse code and carried on the demon-

i think you need to look over the history again. amateur radio predates the FCC by a couple of decades at least.

the only change i currently know of is the opening up of the entire 222 band to novices (along with the creation of the weak signal protected area..) that will be taking effect in the near future.

if we wanted to "protect" 10 M - maybe we should open it up to Novices as on 222 MHz. all the stories i hear seem to revolve around activity from below 28 MHz creeping up into the CW section of the band...but i suspect that pound for

pound, packet and other computer data transfer schemes are amateur radio's best defense against the bootleggers...8).

bill wb9ivr

Date: 12 Dec 93 13:53:17 GMT
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!gatech!concert!news.duke.edu!duke!wolves!psybbs!fredmail@ames.arpa
Subject: W5YI's coverage of "temporary callsigns"
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

on <Dec 04 15:49>, Dan Pickersgill N8PKV to All said:

>> The problem with electronic filing is that it would require each VE
>> team to have a computer with them at the test session, along

DPN> simple 486 could do most of the country. As for the testing
DPN> sessions, a laptop and the appropriate software to send the
DPN> entire session (or a go portion) in a batch mode. You would
DPN> simply poll the FCC and be online a very short time. LD
DPN> charges could be passed on to the entire session. I can not

I've been away. Just why would this be a good idea, again?

Date: Sun, 12 Dec 1993 16:52:06 GMT
From: agate!apple.com!amd!netcomsv!netcom.com!fmitch@ames.arpa
Subject: Why should I bother?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Ed Ellers (EDELERS@delphi.com) wrote:

:
: In light of this, is there really any reason for me to bother reading
: rec.radio.amateur.policy, much less try to contribute? Or to encourage
: others to do so?
:
: -- Ed Ellers, KD4AWQ

well, ed, as the last *real* president we had said "... if you can't stand the heat..."

mitch

--

fmitch@netcom.com

Felton "Mitch" Mitchell, WA4OSR in Mobile, Alabama USA

205-342-7259 home, 205-476-4100 work, 205-476-0465 FAX

co-sysop for W4IAX bbs running fbb ... sysop for WA4OSR DXCluster in Mobile..

Date: Sun, 12 Dec 1993 22:57:14 GMT

From: brunix!maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu!md@uunet.uu.net

Subject: Why should I bother?

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Ed Ellers <EDELERS@delphi.com> writes:

> But what is really incredible was the amount of flak I have caught for the
> "crime" of not quoting liberally from the posts I reply to! I've certainly
> noticed how common it is for a user to include the full text of the message
> being replied to in the reply -- or even the past two or three, as the
> quotes cascade -- and I've been somewhat annoyed at having to read through
> all that stuff, but I haven't complained about it. But when I reply in a
> normal fashion with only my own words, I get remarks about how I'm somehow
> being inconsiderate; I've virtually been ORDERED to either quote the previous
> message or not bother to reply, and Robert has popped up with the bizarre
> claim that my posts appear as though I am talking to myself. (Something
> which makes no sense, as there would be no point in posting to Usenet if I
> actually intended to talk to myself.)

The actual standard which *most* people use is to quote the relevant portion of the message text to which they are specifically addressing a reply.

In this particular message, for example, the current paragraph you are reading is in direct reply to your above posting. If I had simply started replying without bothering to include some text, many USENET participants would have no idea what I am talking about.

It is inconsiderate to include an entire message, or several cascaded messages in your reply (unless you are specifically referring to them in your posting.) Many people do this simply because they are too lazy to edit their post buffer.

Likewise, it is inconsiderate of people not to include a certain amount of relevant quoted material so that the reader can better understand what you are talking about.

In your particular case, however, you were very obnoxious about the entire affair. First you started in with the "my newsreader doesn't

do that, and since your newsreader can't handle threads, too bad, its your problem, your news software is broken". Later, you replied with a long drawn out explanation of how you would have to edit a message via download, edit, upload, etc. Throughout all the exchanges, you attempted to paint your inability to easily quote material as other people's problems. Because of this, you deserve the net.pounding you received.

> I have been blistered for somehow using an "obsolete"
> newsreader (rather difficult when Delphi only wrote it a few months ago).
> Never mind the fact that Delphi's newsreader does provide the ability to
> refer back to previous messages, obviating any need to quote them!

I, for one, even with a threaded newsreader, routinely quote material. The number of sites running threaded newsreaders is minimal, and threaded newsreaders are by no means the "standard" on USENET. If Delphi's software doesn't give you the capability to easily quote material, then I would consider that a serious deficiency in their software package.

> The last straw was when one fellow here (a VK) told me that he was adding my
> name to his killfile, as though I were some sort of scum unworthy of his
> valuable time.

Your right to speak does not mean that I have to listen to you.

> All because I refuse to jump through hoops in order to
> conform to rules that a few people here seem to insist on -- rules that have
> NOT been demanded of me in other Usenet newsgroups in which I participate.

If you don't take a bath, then many people in society will not want to interact with you. Quoting article content for easy content flow is a basic net.manner. Similarly, if you don't want to conform to "society's" standards, don't expect people to interact with you.

> In light of this, is there really any reason for me to bother reading
> rec.radio.amateur.policy, much less try to contribute?

Not with your current attitude.

MD

--

-- Michael P. Deignan

-- Population Studies & Training Center
-- Brown University, Box 1916, Providence, RI 02912
-- (401) 863-7284

Date: 13 Dec 1993 10:16:01 GMT
From: pipex!zaphod.crihan.fr!jussieu.fr!univ-lyon1.fr!elendir@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CHArJ2.Fnw@freenet.carleton.ca>, <DRT.93Nov30083123@world.std.com>,
<SDS.93Dec13023946@cslab1e.cs.brown.edu>fr
Subject : Re: Why isn't Amateur Radio like CB?

Scott Swanson (sds@cs.brown.edu) wrote:
: something. If it was mandatory to show the ham-licence when buying some
: equipment, wouldn't it eliminate some problems by avoiding jerks to buy
: transceivers ?

: Isn't this standard practice? I know that at the store where I buy
: all of my equipment, the standard question when they fill out the
: sales ticket is "Name? Call? Address?"...

Well, in France (at least) it is not. Of course, I dunno about US.

Vince.

--

Date: 13 Dec 93 15:18:28 GMT
From: walter!dancer.cc.bellcore.com!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2dnps0\$511@hpscit.sc.hp.com>, <2e9ftn\$il1@cismsun.univ-lyon1.fr>,
<SDS.93Dec13023946@cslab1e.cs.brown.edu>
Subject : Requiring a license to purchase ham gear,...was Re: Why isn't...

In article <SDS.93Dec13023946@cslab1e.cs.brown.edu>,
Scott Swanson <sds@cs.brown.edu> wrote:
>In article <2e9ftn\$il1@cismsun.univ-lyon1.fr> elendir@enst.fr () writes:
> Two-meters band was *relatively* protected up to now, but it seems to be
> increasingly polluted by "pirates". UHF seems to be still untouched. I wonder
> something. If it was mandatory to show the ham-licence when buying some
> equipment, wouldn't it eliminate some problems by avoiding jerks to buy
> transceivers ?
>

>Isn't this standard practice? I know that at the store where I buy
>all of my equipment, the standard question when they fill out the
>sales ticket is "Name? Call? Address?"...

Let's be realistic here. If it became necessary to "see" a license, then all the mail-order/telephone order sales outfits would have their business go down the drain. Likewise, as has oft been mentioned whenever this discussion comes up (as it inevitably does every few months or so), requiring a license would eliminate the "gift" purchase by non-licensed family members (or friends) for the ham, and...requiring a license would certainly have no or minimal impact on the thousands of USED sales (hamfests, classified advertising, etc.) which take place throughout the year.

Standard Disclaimer- Any opinions, etc. are mine and NOT my employer's.

Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)
Morristown, NJ email via UUCP bcr!cc!whs70
201-829-2879 Weekdays email via Internet whs70@cc.bellcore.com

Date: 13 Dec 93 17:04:02 GMT
From: ogicse!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Dec8.003753.9910@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>,
<DTD8Dc3w165w@mystis.wariat.org>, <2ear03\$ssg@panix.com>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: ARRL's callsign admin position

In article <2ear03\$ssg@panix.com> kb7uv@panix.com (Andrew Funk) writes:
>

>Steve also has an active division "cabinet" made up of all division-level
>appointees, SMS, section-level appointees, and selected others. Before
>each ARRL board meeting he holds a division cabinet meeting to determine
>the position of the division. Quite a number of ARRL Board policies come
>from these meetings, as Steve brings *into* the boardroom the desires and
>opinions of the membership in the Hudson Division.

This is a perfect example of the old boy network in action. The "cabinet" is composed of Steve's appointees. Naturally they reflect his own views to a large extent. While the intent may be to keep a large number of eyes and ears out in the division, and that's good, the result is often, though not certain in this particular case, to be more of an amen chorus from the choir. The current field organization is machine politics at its most raw.

The problem with the League structure as I see it is that it's a one party state controlled mainly by the apparatchiki. It needs a strong loyal opposition to keep it vigorous and honest. I think more directors would help, and directors drawn not just on geographic sections but also from interest groups in amateur radio. If we had a director from the DX community, a director from the packet community, a director from the repeater community, etc in addition to the geographic sections, we'd likely get a more responsive organization. I also think it would be good if members of the field organization were also elected by the groups they would serve, IE traffic people would select their managers etc. This happens to an extent informally now, but I think it should be more of a formalized "merit board" type of thing to reduce the machine politics in the present field organization. (Lord knows though that it's hard enough to find *any* volunteers to take some of these jobs.)

Gary

--

| | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| Gary Coffman KE4ZV | I kill you, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary |
| Destructive Testing Systems | You kill me, | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary |
| 534 Shannon Way | We're the Manson Family | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary |
| Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | -sorry Barney | |

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #525

